

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,421	03/31/2004	Syed F.A. Hossainy	50623.359	7688
Cameron K, K	7590 04/14/200 errigan	EXAM	EXAMINER	
Squire, Sander	s & Dempsey L.L.P.	SILVERMAN, ERIC E		
Suite 300 1 Maritime Pla	nza	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
San Francisco,	CA 94111	1618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/815,421	HOSSAINY, SYED F.A.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Eric E. Silverman, PhD	1618			

	Examiner	ALCOIN						
	Eric E. Silverman, PhD	1618						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 03 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CF4 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:   a)    ☐ The period for reply expires								
b) \(\times\) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. If no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as					
		Fig. at 144-14. A a a						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>								
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in below</li> </ul>		l ain a an ainemilfidea d	ha laawaa far					
appeal: and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues ioi					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•						
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. A Other: See Continuation Sheet.								
/Michael G. Hartley/								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants aver that the office is incorrect in relying on the definition of block copolymer in the specification. Specifically, Applicant notes that the definition block copolymer in the art is a polymer having two or more blocks of different monomers. While that is the starndar definition in the art, it is recognized that Applicants may be their own lexicographers, and when Applicant defarly redefines a term in the specification so as to put the artisan on notice of the meaning that Applicant applies to the term, it is Applicants definition that governs. Here, the specification clearly redefines the term block copolymer to include situations where the two blocks are not linked at the end, which, when interpreted broadly but reasonably, includes situations where the blocks are not chemically bound to one another. The prosecution history has been quite clear as to the meaning attached to Applicants definition. Further, Applicant has had ample opportunity to amend the claims to require that the ends of the block copolymer be inked, but has declined to do so. Apolicant's arounents are therefore not persuasive.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding Applicants' comments about various information disclosure statements, Office records indicate that every information disclosures statement that was submitted in this Application has been returned to Applicant extraction of the properties of the